

Response to the Secretary of State Request for information from the Applicant and others re Proposals For SZC construction from Revd Canon Christine Redgrave Interested Party ID No 20026284.

1. Traffic Mitigation.

I am very concerned that the Applicant does not intend to begin work on the mitigation road works until phase 1 of the site construction has started. EDF have conceded that a link road is necessary, (and a two village by pass) but argue that the road works can wait until phase 1 has begun, because if put in before it will delay the construction of the project by two years and they desire to avoid disturbing breeding seasons! They have had over 10 years to consult but have been very patronizing, failing to listen to the very real concerns of the local community sufficiently. If this proposal is allowed then the local community faces 2 years of extra hell and for those on the route of the B1120 facing excavations behind their property and HGV's etc using the existing road in front for at least 24 months.

As the former Rector of Theberton, Middleton and Yoxford, and Rural Dean Of Saxmundham I feel very angry on their behalf and concerned for the people's wellbeing along the A12 and B1120. Property compensation has been covered but there is no provision for the health issues arising from stress, anxiety and pollution. I have spoken to people who are already very stressed and worried and have lived with the uncertainty for too long.

Furthermore I think that the Grade 1 listed thatched round tower parish Church in Theberton a long side the B1120 will be damaged by the extra vibration. It is priceless terms of its history.

2. Water Supply for the project and during operation.

Many people expressed concern about this matter early on when SZC was being considered. It is as though EDF assumed that NW would just supply their requirement. How can EDF have failed to realise this is the driest area in the country, and to illustrate that fact we have just had 5 weeks with little rain. Thus suddenly we have the proposal for a desalination plant. The applicant's response to -the question how long it could possibly be in use, either for the duration of the build or into its long term generation, seemed totally unsatisfactory. We are told the applicant is still in discussion with NW. There are concerns as to where such a plant may be sited. There is a proposal that it is put on the Site of Sizewell A where the facilities that need to be relocated from Sizewell B are to go, which might therefore necessitate using the Pill Box field for car parking during outage maintenance at B. This field was intended to be planted to compensate for the felling of Coronation Wood. In the long term it could be buried underground, north-west of the SSSI crossing. This surely illustrates that this is a major oversight in EDF's planning and that the SZC site is too small for what is required.

3. The need for new nuclear generation.

EDF are pushing this hard in response to the government's desire for greater UK self sufficiency in energy provision to justify their application. I am not opposed to the government's desire but not on the scale of SZC. 20 + billion is a colossal outlay (Hinkley is already 3 billion over price), and it is an unproven reactor. It is not a quick solution to our energy needs. The current nuclear fuel in Sizewell B is from Russia. I think the minister should be concerned about the future sources of uranium etc .

This is not a green project although generation itself may be clean, pouring concrete on this scale and moving hundreds of tons of earth by lorry, workers by coach and so forth is not environmentally justifiable. 20 billion would enable more homes to be properly insulated, provided with solar panels, heat source pumps. Or the money put towards smaller localised reactors such as that being designed by Rolls Royce.

4. Coastal Erosion.

It is possible that the rock armour and sea defences could be under-mined in the long term. This will leave future generations with an enormous problem. I am not convinced that EDF modelling has looked far enough into the future, this coastline is constantly changing.

Conclusion.

For the reasons given above I do not think the Secretary of State should grant EDF planning permission It is a complicated project, in the wrong place with the potential to destroy the environment and the people who earn their living from tourism, and the preservation of an area of outstanding natural beauty.

Canon Christine Redgrave Interested Party ID20026284